Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1761/22 Recommendation: APPROVE

Site: 36 Lynchmere Avenue, Lancing

Proposal: Erection of summer house to replace hot tub enclosure

Date of Site Visit: 6th December 2022

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings:

The application site is a detached bungalow on a corner plot with Fircroft Avenue running to the south and Lynchmere Avenue to the west. The property frontage is onto Lynchmere Avenue to the west with driveway and garage accessible from this street. Ground level rises to the north and the site is surrounded by bungalows of similar style both semi detached and detached.

Retrospective consent was granted in 2018 for the hot tub enclosure which exists currently under AWDM/0607/18. This is a timber structure with felt tile roof which is located on the property frontage and encloses a hot tub. The structure is set forward of the property frontage to the west and is adjacent to the highway to the south also. There is some hedge screening along the south and west boundary.

Consent is sought here for the erection of a summer house to replace the existing hot tub enclosure. The building is to be a wooden structure with a felt roof and as originally submitted would be the same footprint and height as the existing enclosure and located in the same position.

It was considered that the previous consent for the hot tub enclosure was a balanced case and, as screening was to be provided and it was an open structure, then permission could be granted. As originally submitted, no additional planting was shown and the current hedge is unhealthy and limited screening is provided on the southern boundary. On this basis it was considered by officers that an enclosed structure which was visible would have a greater impact and would set a precedent for such structures adjacent to the highway.

Amended plans were sought to show the ground level reduced so the building would be no higher than the existing enclosure. Sectional drawings were requested which showed how visible the building would be from the street. The drawings showed

planting to the southern corner of the boundary to offer screening where the hedge is low level and unhealthy.

Representations

2 letters received from the owner/occupier of nos. 45 and 47 Lynchmere Avenue making the following comments in relation to the original drawings.

- The plans are incorrect.
- They do not show the raised decking across the back of the property or swimming pool.
- The new structure will be on a hill therefore its height cannot be determined.
- What happens if the hedge dies or falls over.
- Unattractive outlook.
- Not objecting but would like to know the final height of the new building.
- Where will the hot tub end up?
- Overdevelopment
- Out of keeping with streetscene.

Following receipt of amended plans 1 representation has been received stating: -

As long as there is 11m of leylandii at the height shown and the building is lowered then we have no objection to the proposal.

Lancing Parish Council: - Neutral as insufficient details on plans to comment.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

The existing hot tub enclosure is visible within the street scene. When assessing the impact of this in the retrospective application it was considered that the existing

boundary hedge offered some screening and the scale of the structure and use of the materials allow the building to appear subservient to the main dwelling and domestic in appearance. Due to the hedge only the roof is visible and was considered to not be overly dominant within the street scene. It was also considered that if the hedge screening along the southern boundary could be more substantial then this would be acceptable. Consent was granted with a condition relating to the hedge screening as copied below: -

“The hedge screening to the south and west boundary shall be retained and enhanced with new planting, to be planted during the next planting season, and to be maintained at a height sufficient to screen the existing structure hereby permitted from views from the street all times. In the event that the hedge dies within five years following such planting, it shall be replaced with similar hedging in the same position during the next planting season.”

It is not clear if this condition has been complied with however the hedge is still retained and offers screening to some degree although enhancement could be made and this will be necessary to screen the proposed building which is more solid in form and design than the existing open structure. Through negotiation the reduction in height of the building and increased planting as shown on the most recently submitted plans present a screened subservient building. The roof will be less visible than existing and the footprint smaller and the planting enhanced.

On balance, in the light of the above, it is considered that this new building would not be considered to have a greater impact than existing. The sectional drawings show clearly the relative heights of the existing and proposed and the proposed and existing planting.

Residential amenity

As was previously the case the building will not have any adverse impact in terms of overbearing impact, overlooking, loss of light or privacy. The building should only be used for ancillary, domestic use only.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Building should be ancillary use only

4. Planting as shown on approved plans within 3 months of commencement of works to the proposed structure.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation N

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 3rd March 2023

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 6 March 202